



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

➤BOOK ❖ NOTICES.❖◀

SELLIN'S VERBAL-NOMINALE DOPPELNATUR DER HEBRÄISCHEN PARTICIPIEN UND INFINITIVE.*

In this essay, Dr. Sellin has given us a careful inductive treatment of the participle and infinitive, but in connection with these forms he has handled as well, other subjects relating to the syntax and history of the verb. This has been necessitated by the theory on which he has worked. The general plan of this book may be stated as follows: After discussing certain preliminary questions, he proceeds to consider the relation of the Part. to the verb and noun, on the ground of its formation; of its use in the sentence; and of its construction with a following noun. The same order is followed when treating the Infinitive.

In the preliminary inquiries the author vigorously attacks the commonly accepted distinctions between verbs and nouns. Neither action nor time, he says, can be received as giving us the proper differentiation. Grammarians have too often attempted to foist Indo-Germanic analogies upon Semitic grammar. The simple distinction is this, the noun gives us merely a person or thing, the verb unites person or thing with some statement about it. The noun can and does express action, the nominal sentence could not exist in such variety were this not true. From such considerations is found an argument for the priority of the noun to the verb, a priority which it would be absurd to claim, were there no nouns of action, state or suffering, but given these we have till the constituents needful for intelligent vigorous speech.

The priority of the noun to the verb is then his fundamental thesis, which he proceeds further to illustrate and defend, and which is closely linked with his views regarding the Part. The original participial form he considers to have been *qatal*, and in his treatment of the relation of Part. to verb and noun on the ground of formation, many striking facts at once present themselves. The fact that the Part. and the 3d masc. sing. Perf. of the Stative verb are identical is noteworthy; so also is it, that the ע"י Part. Qāl, and the Qāl Perf. go back to the same ground form. The ל"ה Parts. have for their final vowel an original short ä. And this is true of many strong feminine forms. Add to this that the Nīph'āl Part. and Perf. are the same, that occasional forms of Parts. of derived stems occur without preformative מ (e. g., אכל Ex. III. 2), and the presumption is strong, not only that the prevalent קטל forms are a later growth, but that the Perf. 3d masc. sing. is but a noun adapted to new situations and uses. This position receives a new application when the author takes up the Qāl passive Part., which, he regards, not as a remnant of a lost passive stem, but as an undeveloped form, a form from which a passive system might have been evolved, but

* DIE VERBAL-NOMINALE DOPPELNATUR DER HEBRÄISCHEN PARTICIPIEN UND INFINITIVE, UND IHRE DARAUF BERUHENDE VERSCHIEDENE CONSTRUCTION. Preis- und Promotionschrift, Leipzig, 1889, p. 85.

one which the Hebrew never thus utilized. This view would have consequence not only for Hebrew etymology, but also for some doubtful questions connected with Biblical Aramaic.

The tense system and the force of the tense forms are appealed to as another proof of the priority of the Part. The more common explanations of the tense are discarded. The Imperf., it is claimed, does not denote action as incomplete, but the incipience, incidence (Eintritt) of action, while the Perf. represents action as completed, or rather the conclusion of action. Taking this view, the Part. is seen to stand midway between the tenses; conclusion, continuance and incipience of action, being the ideas expressed by the three forms. The author, moreover, argues that if these three forms had been contemporaneous in development, the Part. would have received a like development with the Perf. and Imperf., but the fact that it has not, indicates that it is the primitive form, from which the others have sprung by the addition of preformatives or affirmatives. Another example along the same line is the Assyrian Permansive, a form which expresses, not completion like the Hebrew Perf., to which it is by formation allied, but continuance. Here we have the noun of action arrested in its progress toward tense development, provided with inflectional endings it is true, but unable to give up its true significance as a noun of *enduring* action.

We have further light from the Assyrian in the forms *yakaṭal yakṭal*, which seem to spring directly from the noun of action, the second form having suffered syncope of the vowel.

It is a striking fact that the Part. in Syriac began to take on a complete verbal inflection, and thus a process is actually observed in the more recent history of the language, which has been hypothetically assumed for the early period. There are numerous examples in all languages of the conservative character of linguistic laws, and these show that a speech is not likely to leave its beaten paths nor to manufacture new forms by hitherto untried processes.

Nothing especially new is presented in the treatment of the syntax of Part. Its close relationship to the verb is noted here, and the final conclusion is reached that the Part. is a genuine and preverbal noun, the ancestral source of the verb, but yet a noun, which has in the development of the language taken on more or less of a verbal character.

The discussion of the Infin. is briefer and less interesting than that of the Part., many points having already been settled.

The Infins. are treated as secondary formations both in form and meaning. The same *qaṭal*, *qaṭil* and *qaṭul* forms which developed into the Perf. *qāṭal* and Imperf. *yaqāṭal*, became by syncope and vocalic assimilation *qaṭl*, *qiṭl*, *quṭl*, and thence arose the Infin. Const. of *Qāl*. The similarity between the Perf. and Infin. Const. of the derived stems is obvious; hence these Infins. are assumed to have been the original participial nouns of their respective stems, and to have taken on an abstract meaning when displaced by the forms with **נ**.

The strict nominal character of the Infin. is further attested by the numerous feminine forms in use.

Many examples show that the verbal construction after the Infin. is the ruling one.

The positions of this essay seem to be well taken, and the arguments for the priority of the noun are forcible if not convincing.

There is still much to be said on the proper conception of the tense, particu-

larly of the Imperf., and the analogies and differences between the Assyrian forms and the Hebrew need still further elucidation.

The author's position as to the Passive Part.—its existence as an undeveloped form, is confessedly open to question, but it is certainly a striking fact that not a single assured trace of a Passive Qāl stem, aside from the Passive Part. is to be found in Hebrew.

I am not ready to accept the view that the יִקְטַל form of the Imperf. is simply a differentiation of a more original יִקְטֹל form, nor is the author's account of the origin of Segholates from the qatāl, qatīl and qatūl forms altogether satisfactory. Despite their abstract meaning these forms seem to stand nearer the simple root, and appear more likely to be the first products of speech than are the longer, bivocalic nouns.

But on the whole this essay is a very satisfactory treatment of a neglected department of Hebrew grammar, its method and spirit commend it to the reader, and we welcome all such attempts to shed a clearer light upon special questions of Semitic philology.

A. S. CARRIER.

THE DIVINE NAME ADONAJ AND ITS HISTORY.*

A critical student of Hebrew philology seldom feels more satisfaction than will be experienced in reading this little book by Dr. Dalman. It is a rigidly scientific and thoroughly exhaustive examination of the word Adonaj, and especially of the obscure history of its substitution for the ancient and peculiarly sacred name of יְהוָה. To this task the author applies a surprising wealth of learning, and an untiring patience in the discovery and investigation of facts. The results also, as may be inferred, are considerably at variance with the hitherto commonly accepted results of a mere superficial study. A statement of the topics considered in the nine chapters will prepare us for a closer survey of the contents: 1. Baal, Adon, Adonaj. 2. Adonaj and Adoni. 3. The suffix of Adonaj. 4. A Survey of the Uses of Adonaj. 5. The Fact of the Substitution of Adonaj for Jahve. 6. Jewish Testimonies to the Uses of the Divine Name. 7. History and Significance of the Transition from Jahve to Adonaj. 8. The Names Lord and Christ. 9. Appendix: The Masora on Adonaj.

From a careful examination of the material at hand, little can be gleaned as to the actual history of אֲדֹנָי. There certainly does not appear to be any progress from a conscious use of the suffix to a meaningless use of the same. Some striking facts are, however, pointed out in connection with its use. "We find it pretty evenly distributed in the historical books, but it occurs only seldom in Ezra-Nehemiah, and not at all in the priestly sources of the Hexateuch, nor in Chronicles and Esther. If we assume Ps. xc. and following to be of later origin, we perceive the same decrease. Pss. i.-xc. have אֲדֹנָי forty-six times, Pss. xc.-cl. only nine times. In the prophets the use of אֲדֹנָי is clearly dependent on individual peculiarity. 1 Isaiah and Amos have it often, their contemporary Hosea not at all, and Micah only twice. In the Chaldean period it is found fre-

* STUDIEN ZUR BIBLISCHEN THEOLOGIE: DER GOTTESNAME ADONAJ UND SEINE GESCHICHTE. Von Gustaf H. Dalman, Ph. D. Berlin: 1890. Pp. 91.